



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,657	08/28/2003	Kenichi Nakatate	Q76816	6914
7590 04/23/2008 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3213				
EXAMINER DEHGHAN, QUEENIE S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,657

Applicant(s)

NAKATATE ET AL.

Examiner

Queenie Dehghan

Art Unit

1791

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, 11 and 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, 11, 15-21, 27 and 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magome et al. (2002/0145711) in view of Urano et al. (English translation of JP Abstract 2000-103629) and Fujinoki et al. (English machine translation of JP 2000-095535).
4. Regarding claims 1, 9, and 10, Magome et al. disclose an apparatus comprising a container (6) filled with a gas containing hydrogen ([0103], figure 1), an optical element of silica glass, such as a lens, accommodated in the container, and an excimer

Art Unit: 1791

laser emitting UV light such as a KrF or ArF excimer laser, ([0032], [0057], [0121]), wherein the optical element and light source are aligned so that the light is incident on the optical element (figure 1). However, Magome et al. fail to disclose the pressure of the hydrogen gas. Urano et al. teach placing a quartz glass article in an atmosphere comprising hydrogen with a partial pressure of 0.1-10 atm (0.1-10kgf/cm²) when irradiating the glass article with UV light (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the partial pressure of hydrogen as taught by Urano et al. in the apparatus of Magome et al. in order to inhibit the increase loss of UV transmission of the optical elements, as taught by Urano et al.

5. Furthermore, Magome et al. fail to disclose an optical element that has been subjected to a heat treatment. Fujinoki et al. teach heat treating an optical element in a hydrogen atmosphere before accommodating in the container, wherein the pressure of the hydrogen atmosphere is 10 atm (10kgf/cm²) and the temperature is 300-450°C ([0019]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the heat treatment of Fujinoki for the optical elements placed in the container of Magome et al. in order to provide for an optical element that has high endurance for irradiation of an UV laser, as taught by Fujinoki et al.

6. Regarding claims 5-7, Magome et al. disclose a shut-off valve disposed on the inlet of the container that is connected to an external element for supplying the gas into the container (figure 1, 2, [0060]). Magome et al. further disclose an outlet (93) for the hydrogen gas (figure 1, [0069]).

Art Unit: 1791

7. Regarding claim 8, Magome et al. fail to disclose the concentration of the hydrogen gas. Urano et al. teach using pure hydrogen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the pure hydrogen gas of Urano et al. in Magome et al. apparatus in order to ensure enough hydrogen is present to prevent the UV irradiation degradation.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magome et al. (2002/0145711) in view of Urano et al. (English translation of JP Abstract 2000-103629) and Fujinoki et al. (English machine translation of JP 2000-095535), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ohtsu et al. (6,793,980). Magome et al. disclose a mixed gas atmosphere, but fail to disclose the concentration of the hydrogen in the gas atmosphere. Ohtsu et al. teach an atmosphere of a nitrogen gas containing 3% vol. Hydrogen for irradiating a glass plate with an excimer laser (col. 10 lines 53-59, col. 7 lines 21-29). Although Ohtsu et al method is primarily focused on forming a film, Ohtsu et al. presents an application wherein a chamber containing a glass element is exposed to a reducing environment, which is a gas containing hydrogen, when exposed to exposure light from an excimer laser. This is an environment similar to that of the exposure apparatus of Magome et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the hydrogen concentration of Ohtsu et al. in the container of Magome et al. in order to provide for a reducing environment that is below the explosion limit of the hydrogen gas, as taught by Ohtsu.

9. Claims 11 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hagiwara et al. (6,222,610) in view of Urano et al. (English translation of JP

Abstract 2000-103629), and Fujinoki et al. (English machine translation of JP 2000-095535).

10. Regarding claims 11, Hagiwara et al. disclose a container filled with a gas containing hydrogen (col. 2 lines 33-37, col. 12, lines 23-28). Furthermore, Hagiwara et al. disclose the container having a first light transmission window (9A in figure 1), and an optical element in the container (9B in figure 1), wherein the optical element is aligned to receive ultraviolet light incident upon the transmission window (figure 1, col. 6 lines 8-11), wherein the ultraviolet light is emitted from a KrF or ArF excimer laser (col. 2 lines 6-10). However, Hagiwara et al. fail to disclose the pressure of the hydrogen gas used in the container. Urano et al. teach placing a quartz (silica) glass article in an atmosphere comprising hydrogen with a partial pressure of 0.1-10 atm (0.1-10kgf/cm²) when irradiating the glass article with UV light (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the partial pressure of hydrogen as taught by Urano et al. in the apparatus of Hagiwara et al. in order to inhibit the increase loss of UV transmission of the optical elements, as taught by Urano et al.

11. Furthermore, Hagiwara et al. fail to disclose an optical element that has been subjected to a heat treatment. Fujinoki et al. teach heat treating an optical element in a hydrogen atmosphere before accommodating in the container, wherein the pressure of the hydrogen atmosphere is 10 atm (10kgf/cm²) and the temperature is 300-450°C ([0019]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the heat treatment of Fujinoki for the optical elements

placed in the container of Hagiwara et al. in order to provide for an optical element that has high endurance for irradiation of an UV laser, as taught by Fujinoki et al.

12. Regarding claims 15-17, Hagiwara et al. disclose shut-off and check valves disposed on the inlet of the container that is connected to an external element for supplying the gas into the container. Hagiwara et al. further disclose an outlet for the hydrogen gas (figure 2, col. 7 line 64 to col. 8 line 15, abstract).

13. Regarding claim 18, Hagiwara et al. fail to disclose the concentration of the hydrogen gas. Urano et al. teach using pure hydrogen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the pure hydrogen gas of Urano et al. in Hagiwara et al. apparatus in order to ensure enough hydrogen is present to prevent the UV irradiation degradation.

14. Regarding claims 19-21, Hagiwara et al. disclose a light transmission window that is a lens (9A) and an optical element that is a lens (9B) as well (figure 2, col. 6 lines 8-11). Hagiwara et al. also disclose a container further comprising a second light transmission window, arranged to transmit ultraviolet light incident upon the first transmission window after the ultraviolet light is transmitted through the optical element (9C in figure 2).

15. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Magome et al. (2002/0145711) in view of Urano et al. (English translation of JP Abstract 2000-103629), and Fujinoki et al. (English machine translation of JP 2000-095535), as applied to claim 1 above, and Hagiwara et al. (6,222,610) in view of Urano et al. (English translation of JP Abstract 2000-103629), and Fujinoki et al. (English

Art Unit: 1791

machine translation of JP 2000-095535), as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Ito et al. (5,867,618). Magome, Urano, Hagiwara, Fujinoki and Ohtsu do not specifically disclose a partial pressure of hydrogen set in the range of 300 to 500kgf/cm². Ito et al. teach treating an optical element in a container filled with hydrogen gas at a partial pressure in the range of 20 to 400 atm and provide an example where the hydrogen pressure is 300atm (310kgf/cm²) (col. 5 lines 61-62, col. 6 lines 1-3, 43-44). Doing so would result in an optical element that is irradiated with UV light to have an increased photoinduced refractive index change and an increase transmission of light, as taught by Ito et al. (col. 1 lines 40-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the partial pressure of hydrogen gas of 300atm, as taught by Ito et al., in the process of Magome, Hagiwara, Fujinoki, Ohtsu, and Urano, because Ito et al. teach that the saturation of the hydrogen is effective at 300 atm.

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed January 25, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. In the applicant's argument regarding the gas containing hydrogen with a partial pressure of 0.01 to 500 kgf/cm², the applicant argues that Urano provides no teaching of a continuous supply of hydrogen. It is not apparent from the applicant's argument how the continuous supply of gas is any support or relevance to the whether the gas has a partial pressure of 0.01 to 500 kgf/cm². Once again, the rejection presented

discloses a hydrogen gas with a partial pressure of $0.1\text{-}10\text{kgf/cm}^2$ to be used when exposing a silica glass article to UV light. Furthermore, the limitation of a continuous supply of hydrogen gas is no longer recited in the claims.

18. The applicant also argues that the object of Magome is to provide an apparatus in which light superior transmissivity of UV light and superior cooling performance for the optical elements are ensured. Magome may have other embodiments and teachings for the use of the apparatus. However, it is still clear that Magome also provides for an apparatus filled with hydrogen gas, an optical element, and a light source, just as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, the applicant points out that Magome uses a F_2 laser and speculates the glass material used in the optical elements. This is mere speculation that is unsupported. Additionally, Magome does disclose a light source from a KrF or ArF excimer laser as well.

19. In regards to the applicant's argument with respect to Hagiwara, Hagiwara may present other objectives and embodiments to the use of the apparatus, nonetheless, Hagiwara provides for an apparatus filled with a gas containing hydrogen, a first light transmission window, and an optical element in the container.

20. In regards to the applicant's arguments with respect to reference of Ohtsu, the prior art of Ohtsu is no longer used with Hagiwara and Urano since the hydrogen gas concentration limitation has been deleted.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Queenie Dehghan whose telephone number is (571)272-8209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P. Griffin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1791

Q Dehghan